

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
January 4, 2007**

NOTE: These minutes are not a full transcription of the meeting. Tapes are available for public review in the Redmond Planning Department.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Dennis Cope, Lee Madrid, David Scott Meade, and Sally Promer-Nichols

STAFF PRESENT: Judd Black, Development Review Manager; Steve Fischer and Gary Lee, Senior Planners; Asma Jeelani, Assistant Planner; Amy Keenan and Kerry Kriner, Associate Planners

The Design Review Board is appointed by the City Council to make decisions on design issues regarding site planning, building elevations, landscaping, lighting and signage. Decisions are based on the design criteria set forth in the Redmond Development Guide.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by the Chairperson of the Design Review Board Sally Promer-Nichols at 7:05 PM. Design Review Board members Robert Hall, Mery Velastegui and David Wobker were excused.

MINUTES

November 2, 2006:

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MEADE AND SECONDED BY MS. PROMER-NICHOLS TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 2, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES AS PRESENTED. MOTION CARRIED (2-0-2, WITH MR. COPE AND MR. MADRID ABSTAINING).

November 16, 2006:

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MADRID AND SECONDED BY MR. MEADE TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 16, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES AS PRESENTED. MOTION CARRIED (3-0-1, WITH MR. COPE ABSTAINING).

APPROVAL

L060510, Microsoft Building 33 Expansion

Description: Executive Briefing Center EBC expansion for Building 33

Location: 16070 NE 36th Way

Architect: Steve Olsen with SKB Architects

Landscape Architect: Steve Klem with Brumbaugh & Associates

Applicant: Joy Okazaki with Turner Construction

Prior Review Date: December 7, 2006

Staff Contact: Kerry Kriner / 425.556.2464

Kerry Kriner, Associate Planner, gave a brief overview of the project. The proposal is to add a second-story addition. The Board thought very favorably of this proposal at the first review on December 7, 2006.

Walt Niehoff with LMN Architects presented for the applicant. He explained that the building had not changed much from the last presentation. They were working on two things—the possibility of doing an undulating curved ceiling and adding a linear skylight but were still at the discovery stage. They were still tracking down the exact specs of the metal color. They talked to Microsoft about getting two or three large mockups made of the metal, so they could position them on the building and make a final decision. To Mr. Madrid's question about mitigating the blank walls of the tower, Mr. Niehoff responded that they were using a landscape foreground for that. To Ms. Kriner's explanation that staff wanted to see something more substantial than small shrubs to screen the tower, he responded that they were considering moving the tall conifers over. If they could not save them, they would replace them in kind. There was another deciduous tree they were considering moving to another part of the Microsoft campus.

Mr. Cope commented that the drawings the DRB was being asked to approve still showed the east elevation incorrectly by showing precast above the existing door.

Mr. Madrid and Mr. Cope both wanted to see the colors and the undulating ceiling before final approval.

Mr. Niehoff explained that there are only two colors available for the metal panels—champagne and light bronze.

Mr. Meade commented that from the beginning he had hoped they would go toward a darker color.

There was agreement that the DRB could approve the application with what the applicant had presented that night, but the applicant should return for approval if they come up with something different.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MEADE AND SECONDED BY MR. COPE TO APPROVE L060510, MICROSOFT BUILDING 33 EXPANSION, WITH CONDITIONS: STAFF RECOMMENDATION #1, BLANK WALL TREATMENT MUST BE INCORPORATED INTO THE NEW PROPOSED STAIR ENCLOSURE OR PROVIDED ADJACENT TO THIS STRUCTURE TO MITIGATE THE NEW SOLID PRECAST SURFACE AND REMOVAL OF EXISTING VEGETATION ALONG THE EAST FAÇADE OF THE BUILDING, AND DETAILS OF THE MITIGATION WERE TO BE WORKED OUT WITH STAFF; STAFF RECOMMENDATION #2, THE STANDARD PROVISION ABOUT PRESENTATION MATERIALS INCONSISTENCIES WITH THE ASSUMPTION THAT THE DRB IS APPROVING THE PROSPECTUS AND NOT THE ELEVATIONS BECAUSE OF THE INCONSISTENCIES; AND APPROVE THE COLOR AND MATERIAL PALLET AS PRESENTED AT THIS MEETING WITH THREE COLOR OPTIONS FOR THE METAL. MOTION CARRIED (4-0).

APPROVAL

L060508, Grass Lawn Improvement Phase 3

Description: Renovate an existing three-acre portion of the southeast corner of the park and construct a pavilion and a park maintenance building

Location: 7031 148th Ave NE / Old Redmond Road

Architect: Wayne Ivary with Ivary & Associates

Landscape Architect: Bruce Dees with Bruce Dees & Associates

Applicant: Tim Cox with City of Redmond Parks Department

Prior Review Date: September 7, 2006

Staff Contact: Amy Keenan / 425.556.2407

Amy Keenan, Associate Planner, presented the staff report, including the staff recommendations.

Steve Gibbs, project manager for the City of Redmond, had a revised site plan. He reported that they had obtained a Low Impact Development (LID) grant from the Department of Ecology for the green roof and the two rain gardens on the perimeter that capture storm water runoff.

Bruce Dees, Bruce Dees & Associates, landscape architect, explained that the pavement inside the building now extends outside the building. Each area could function independently, but everything is essentially one unit. All the materials would be the same color and texture; porous concrete and asphalt would be used. He responded to the concern about the number of trees that are being removed, but explained they are unhealthy and crowded together. All trees that are being removed are being replaced.

Wayne Ivary, Ivary & Associates, architect, commented that there was not much change to the pavilion. They have gone to a metal siding that is the same as was used on the maintenance facility. Regarding security and visibility for the restroom door, they moved the sliding door to where there is more direct access. He showed the proposed earth-tone colors for the masonry. Continuous bonding separates the masonry from the metal. The pavilion will be semi-heated with a gas fireplace. The maintenance building, designed to be a low building, is being hidden in the northeast corner away from public circulation. There is a berm up to the building, a fenced screen that goes around the front of it, and the building will blend into the landscaping. There will be a green roof on the building.

COMMENTS BY THE DRB MEMBERS:

Mr. Meade:

- Thought the project had been improved since the last review.
- Appreciated what they were doing with regard to tree health.
- Was pleased that they were addressing the visibility issues with the restrooms.
- Thought the green roof on the maintenance building was great, but hoped it would not be allowed to be covered with stray tennis balls from the courts.
- Confirmed with the applicant that they were putting a graffiti coating on the wall since the door would be vulnerable to graffiti. He suggested changing the color of the door to a darker color.
- Inquired about the concrete material the applicant was using; was excited about that product because it looks like concrete and is mostly sand and cement based that can be stamped or scored, and he uses it often on his projects.

Mr. Cope:

- Was happy they got the LID grant—very excellent!
- Said he could not approve the landscape plan because there was not enough information.
- Noted that the fence around the maintenance building and the enclosure around the cell phone tower were not showing on the drawings in the packet.
- Wanted to know why they needed five more parking spaces. (Mr. Gibbs explained that there is high demand for parking on the site.) (Mr. Ivary said that adding these five spaces does not add impervious surface.) (Mr. Meade pointed out that the adjacent neighborhoods are flooded with Grass Lawn Park's overflow parking.)
- Commented that the restroom in the maintenance building is not drawn to be ADA accessible; would need 18 inches.
- Said he could not tell from the drawing how they were dealing with siding or the CMU.
- Commented that he would expect to see more information regarding those things not included in the documents.

Mr. Madrid:

- Liked the project; thought it a smart-looking building.
- Determined that the bouldering material is a synthetic material manufactured to look like boulders and would be more realistic than the climbing feature at Marymoor Park.
- Confirmed that the sidewalk material would be a porous concrete producing no water runoff with coloring similar to, but slightly different than, the patio area.
- Agreed with Mr. Cope that a landscape plan is needed for the record and to add substance.

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- Clarified the rain garden's location with the applicant.
- Wanted to know about the planting material on the roof; found out there would be 8 inches of soil with grass.
- Encouraged that the ivy continue to cover the rock wall.
- Clarified that the existing berm was the only landscaped area next to the maintenance building.
- Clarified that the edge of the boulder area has a curb that divides it from the lawn, with the rocks seeming to become a part of the curb.
- Concurred that a landscape plan is needed.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. COPE AND SECONDED BY MR. MADRID TO APPROVE PRE060046, (L060508) GRASS LAWN IMPROVEMENT PHASE 3, AS SUBMITTED WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS: APPROVE THE BUILDINGS, BUT THE APPLICANT MUST RETURN WITH A LANDSCAPE PLAN PROVIDING DETAIL FOR THE FENCE, BOULDERING AREA, CURBING, THE GREEN ROOF, AND ANYTHING ELSE BEING DONE ON THIS SITE; THAT THE SPECIFIC FIELD COLOR OF THE CMU FOR THE BUILDING IS WHAT IS SHOWN ON THE APPLICANT'S BOARD AS THE MIDDLE OF THE THREE, THE COLOR CALLED "MESA TAN"; THAT THE MAINTENANCE BUILDING MATERIALS ARE AS SHOWN ON THE APPLICANT'S DRAWINGS AT THIS MEETING BUT NOT ON THE DRAWINGS IN THE PACKET; AND THE OTHER STAFF-RECOMMENDED

CONDITIONS; SIDEWALKS SHOULD BE DIFFERENTIATED FROM THE VEHICULAR PATHS BY TEXTURING, COLOR, OR USE OF A DIFFERENT MATERIAL; THE APPLICANT SHOULD PROVIDE LIGHTING FIXTURE CUT SHEETS; AND THE STANDARD PRESENTATION MATERIALS INCONSISTENCIES PROVISION. MOTION CARRIED (4-0).

APPROVAL

L060503, River Park Mixed-Use Project

Description: 316 housing units; 145-room hotel; 108,593-square foot office; 18,800-square foot retail

Location: 7805 159th Place NE

Architect: Bob Tiscareno with Tiscareno Associates

Landscape Architect: Kris Snider with Hewitt Architects

Applicant: Darcy Garnau with Legacy Partners

Prior Review Dates February 2, May 4, July 6, August 3, 2006

Staff Contact: Gary Lee / 425.556.2418

Gary Lee, Senior Planner, presented the staff report for the approval of this project that had previously been through four pre-application reviews. At the last review, the DRB members commented that they were ready to see the application. Since that time, there has been one fairly significant change that is not really visible from above ground. The parking garage is now consolidated under Buildings A, B and E. He read the staff recommendations.

Scott McKay explained that they wanted to make sure the colors coordinated with the color board and were the appropriate colors. There were a few minor changes to the hotel. They provided a 3-D model of the residential buildings because of the complex design. They also refined the design on Building E on the left and changed the office façade on Building D. The park edge would have a little ripple. They are mid-stream with discussions with the Parks Department and would like to have some flexibility with that at the end. They provided two options, a maximal and a minimal design, for the interface between the development and Luke McRedmond Park. They removed the garage entry on Building C, which is now built down to the ground. There is no longer a fire connection between the park's parking lot and Building C. There is a grand staircase and an ornamental tree between Buildings A and E.

Mr. Cope requested a detailed walk through the landscape plan, especially paying attention to the 159th Place NE area, since the applicant had promised extremely attractive landscaping there.

Kris Snyder with Hewitt Architects gave an overview of the plan, starting with 159th Place NE. Since this is a critical edge, they wanted to push the building back from the street. They considered this an excellent opportunity to take the park and wrap it around the edge and to have no pedestrian frontage. They wanted to frame the entrance on River Park Drive and take the eye down to the center of the project, and there would be a series of water features along the entry on that drive. There would also be stairs and a handicapped ramp at the entrance there. A relatively wide sidewalk flanked the trees along River Park Drive. They were able to save the large tree to the north of Building C at the entrance to the park's parking lot. He anticipated having a lot of landscaping in the plaza in front of Buildings B, D and E and some special paving patterns with some integral color in the plaza. There would be some flush-with-grade wood decking along the south side of Lagoon Lane, going toward the park. They would add some softness to that edge, and there would be architectural meanders that pick up on the river meandering. They are retaining the existing trees in the park. There would be a private walkway or boardwalk along the west side of Building A. There would be tall trees to soften the office building and more formal landscape for Building E. There would be an elevator element or aisle that brings people up from the garage in front of the hotel lobby. Between Buildings A and B there would be a walkway a floor above the park, consisting of half public hardscape and architectural, and the other half more verdant and soft green.

Mark Ludtka with Callison spoke about staff's desire to use fritted or frosted glass on the windows of Building D to prevent the ground floor windows on the north elevation from being perpetually shuttered or covered to prevent viewing into the space. The actual concern there is that they do not want to see a lot of clutter, but they do want to be able to see activity. The north light is fantastic light to allow into the building. Putting in a frosted glass would intrude on that. One thing to note is that if they are on the

sidewalk level and looking at the ground floor level of the office building, the western side floor level would be about five feet above that elevation and on the eastern side about 3 feet above with a 30-inch sill, so from the sidewalk one could not see fully into the space. At Mr. Meade's suggestion at the last review, they had introduced a lighter colored brick for the portion above the base instead of the precast material.

Mr. Meade confirmed that the drawing on page 46 was correct and page 47 was not correct because of a missing brick element.

Ray Johnston with Johnston Architects reported that they had been working with the water intrusion people and had been making minor adjustments in the balconies by changing some of the checkerboard balconies to stacking balconies in as many locations as possible. For water intrusion and economic reasons, the space between Building E and the office building had become richer.

Regarding using frosted glass on the frontage of the 159th intersection, Mr. McKay explained that there are two conflicting code sections and a utility easement there. The entry on 159th Place NE would be the main entry into the project, so the applicant could be counted on to make that look great. The garage lights would be shielded with some combination of screening and light protections on lights nearest the edge. He pointed out the transformer locations on the site plan, explaining that there would be one transformer for each building.

Jeff Krahbiel with Jeff Krahbiel Associates addressed the wall of the mechanical room in Building D. They had added a landscaped area adjacent to the building and separated the 6.5-foot ramp from the street. They shortened the length of the building by 20 feet and added more balconies on the northeast corner. He thought that would be a pretty soft area and the landscaping would soften the lower portion. He explained that there was a lot of glass included and building changes on the upper portions. He was not sure what adding spandrel to the lower levels would accomplish.

Mr. Meade suggested using a wall-mounted trellis or a horizontal band that could create some shadow and detail. He requested to see the plant palette for Building D on 159th Place NE.

Mr. Snyder explained that the City wanted honey locusts for the street trees. In the grove in front of Building D, the hope was in the wintertime not to have the darkness of evergreen trees. They should grow together well to a minimum of 3-inch caliper trees that are 12-15 feet tall.

COMMENTS BY THE DRB MEMBERS:

Mr. Cope:

- Commented that he had asked to see the proximities of public transportation, but he could not find that on the plans—not there.
- Appreciated page 8, but the only question to that is whether the strategies are accurate to the LEED scoring. (The applicant confirmed that the green strategies apply to the project as a whole and not to each individual building. He also confirmed that each building would come with that sheet, and there would be a response for each building. The applicant said they were trying to encourage LEED strategies, but are not required to meet a LEED standard. Each project has to use a different strategy, but they will encourage every entity to use the LEED standards. They have not put together a list because they are still going through CD, so it was a little early to commit to a list. They have never committed to a full green strategy, but generally plan to use green roofs and VOC paints, glues, cabinetry and appliances.)
- Said he could not find a directional arrow on any of the drawings except the one on page 4.
- Did not agree with staff's recommendation #1.
- Agreed with what was said about not being able to see what is going on in the building while going down the street. Did not like the fritted glass recommendation.
- Agreed with staff's recommendation #3, especially with that elevation being on 159th Place NE.
- Thought all the transformers were fine, but did question the one next to Building D opposite the loading area because it would mean that from the adjacent property there would be a direct view

into the loading area because not able to landscape. (The applicant told him there would be a fence line.)

- Said he did not see the commitment to extremely attractive landscaping. He would expect some of the things that are not on the plan. Did not feel that was a knockout, extremely attractive part of the site. To him, this landscaping was more of the same and not particularly creative. Of the possible things that could be done, the applicant did not do any of them. The landscaping plan for Building D still missed the mark significantly. They should activate it and make it interesting. Planting trees would not do it. There was not really enough detail about landscaping to support that part of the project at this time.
- Said he saw the little bits of blue that he assumes are water features, but did not know anything about them. He probably could support this, but he did not know enough to support it.
- Liked all the hotel changes. They addressed so many of the DRB's concerns from the last review. Was glad they responded that way.
- Continued to like the park edge for Buildings A and B. Thought there would be a nice zone between the edge of the project and the park.
- Said that his preference for how this project meets the park was the maximal one on the right designed to look more like the last plan on page 9. Last time this transition was much more like an amphitheater and would encourage the activities that happen in the park. He liked the more involved and articulated meeting between the two but with the steps designed as before.
- Confirmed that the courtyards between Buildings A and B were not being approved at this meeting.
- Liked the lighter colored brick shown on pages 45-46 and considered that a very thoughtful response to DRB comments and a very nice solution. Seemed to him that when he looked at page 45 the center showed shadow lines, but on the prospectus he did not see anything that would cast that kind of shadow. He explained that there is no reason to be showing elevations that do not truly reflect what will happen. The prospective showed what will happen, but the elevations show much more shadow casting than would occur. He admonished them not to show things that would not occur. On page 46 the roof screen was rather prominent and would certainly be seen from West Lake Sammamish Parkway. He would prefer that be articulated with a little more attention to detail similar to the other project to be reviewed later in the evening from Callison for Microsoft.
- Liked the long elevations on pages 55-56.
- Preferred the checkerboard balconies, but would defer to the architect.
- Said he was fine with Building D as it is an office building with a better design this review and thought that building was as good as could be done. He thought they had done a fine job on it, but they should not have shown a texture from shadow lines that were not there.

Mr. Meade:

- Shared Mr. Cope's comments on staff recommendation #1, but noted the probability of passersby looking up and seeing light fixtures while driving along 159th Place NE. His opinion was that activity is desperately needed. Frosted glass would turn eyes back to the street and make a dead zone. There is some space in front of that building that could be used in a better way. Something that has some hardscape and adds a pedestrian element such as seat walls. (Staff explained that the concern is more that the occupants in the building put screens on the windows that are not complementary to the desired pedestrian character desired for the street. The preference is to be able to see clearly into the windows and perhaps have a requirement that nothing be put on the windows.) Mr. Meade said that he would support that part of the condition.
- Commented about staff recommendation #3 for the blank wall on the hotel building. Said that the hotel building plan is an amazing improvement in regard to color and especially the access to the park. Some treatment there is going to be critical. It is above the ground panel on the brick level and into the two upper levels. He assumed they would review that later.
- Commented about the contrast of page 9 with page 10, showing that more detail is needed on the hardscape and softscape for a better understanding of the pedestrian activity plan.
- Was amazed at the designs for Buildings A, B and E. He thought the model to be stunning. These are the showcases of the project. He wished that they were located on the street because

they would have to get people on the site to experience the site. Building D would be a hard one to get past. For the hotel, the palette had changed and the colors were much more desirable. The blank wall treatment was great. The elevator concept coming from the garage was interesting. He was really pleased with the overall direction of the hotel. The hotel had gotten very lush. He was glad they had the opportunity to keep refining that building.

- Shared Mr. Cope's comments about the deceiving shadows on Building D. The shadow lines are over-exaggerated. The perspective was more realistic, showing the building to be fairly flat. The brick is more suitable for the downtown corridor than precast concrete. He wanted this building to be very exciting. This is not a sexy building and looks very utilitarian. He knew a lot of effort had gone into Building D, but Building D was the odd man out and needed to have more pop to sizzle. Building D needed things to activate it and integrate it into the community. Now it looked like it wanted to stand alone and like a security building. The corrugated mechanical screening on top needed some modulation and to be integrated into the building design, so it would look as if it were part of the building and not a screening element. This would be extremely prominent coming down Redmond Way. This needed some attention so it would not look like an afterthought. He wanted to see that design come back and see it done right. To incorporate the pedestrianscape in front of this building, there have to be opportunities to explore. Hopefully, when the applicant returned with the site plan there could be some wow-factor provided.
- Suggested doing some simple things outside Building D that would not affect the building itself. The front piece was an opportunity to pull the vision toward the street and away from the building, using color, movement and plantings of a certain scale. They could put public art or attachments to the building without affecting the footprint of the building.

Mr. Madrid:

- Commented that overall the project had been getting better and better.
- Liked the scope of the project and what it represented, particularly the landscaping.
- Agreed that the glass did not need to be frosted, but did need to require that no blinds or anything else could be placed in those windows.
- Agreed with all the other staff recommendations.
- Thought they had worked on the corners of Building D to improve the looks or at least that building has more articulations than the rest of the building, which is lacking. This is a utilitarian building and shows its purpose. When he found out that the setback of the mechanical screening from the front of the building was 45 feet, he recommended an increase to 46 feet and trying to incorporate the screens into the building. There are ways to take the screen and bring in simple elements of the building, so it does not look like a blank panel. He recommended breaking that up, so it did not look so horizontal.
- Thought the residential building was great—loved it!
- Liked the conceptual landscape plan, but agreed that the applicant needed a detailed landscape plan.
- Commented that he liked the design of the office building, Building D

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- Agreed that the landscape plan needed to return.
- Agreed with Mr. Cope on the park connection; preferred the maximal option shown but liked the grander stair gesture.
- Thought that Building D did not look like part of the project. If she were driving down 159th Place NE, she would think it was a separate piece of property. She did not expect this building to be completely redesigned but thought something should be done to give it a little more complexity on the exterior.
- Liked the checkerboard and the stacked balconies, but would defer the choices and placement to the architect.
- Agreed that she liked the design of the office building, Building D.

Mr. McKay spoke about Building D, saying that he understood that the texture of the hotel and the residential buildings were much richer. Both the hotel and the residential are residential buildings so

some granularity could be added to them. The office building is a single building, and the needs are driving it to a box form. Trammell Crow has come out on a limb to do an office building in downtown Redmond. An office building has a regular form, and it is basically how that form is skinned to bring it texture. Group Health is not going to build a building where there are all the extras like big overhangs and lots of shadow lines. He explained that the current design is realistic in terms of what they can afford to build and get financed. The garage has been massively redesigned to get them back to budget. This is the only project in the region that is mixed use with all four possible uses. The City in its development agreement wanted an internal-facing project with inward-focused retail, or to have the best elevation facing in. Office buildings cannot afford to have two entrance elevations. This project is really pushing the envelope for Redmond.

Steve Fischer, Senior Planner, explained that Building D must have more than a grove of trees to make a connection between the street and the building.

There was agreement among staff, the applicant representatives and the DRB members that the Board could approve a conceptual landscape plan and then require that a detailed landscape be approved by the DRB before the building permit is issued.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MADRID AND SECONDED BY MR. COPE TO APPROVE L060503, RIVER PARK MIXED USE PROJECT, WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- **AMENDED STAFF RECOMMENDATION #1 THAT THE APPLICANT DOES NOT NEED TO USE FROSTED OR FRITTED GLASS ON THE GROUND FLOOR WINDOWS ON THE NORTH ELEVATION OF BUILDING D, AND THE GLASS SHALL REMAIN CLEAR. THE GLASS ON THE LOWER END OF THE RESIDENTIAL BUILDING SHOULD REMAIN CLEAR WITHOUT INTERNAL OR EXTERNAL WINDOW COVERINGS.**
- **REGARDING STAFF RECOMMENDATION #2, THE APPLICANT WOULD RETURN WITH A DETAILED LANDSCAPE DESIGN FOR THE SIDEWALK ALONG 159TH PLACE AND THE OFFICE BUILDING (BUILDING D) TO INCLUDE PEDESTRIAN-ATTRACTING FEATURES, SUCH AS RAISED PLANTERS, WATER FEATURES, ETC.**
- **THE BLANK WALLS OF THE MECHANICAL ROOMS (EAST ELEVATION AND EAST SIDE OF THE NORTH ELEVATION) OF THE HOTEL (BUILDING C) SHALL INCLUDE WINDOWS OR SPANDREL GLASS TO COMPLEMENT THE WINDOW PATTERNS ON EITHER SIDES OF THE MECHANICAL ROOM TO SOFTEN THE APPEARANCE OF THE MECHANICAL ROOM FACADES AT THE STREET AND PRIMARY ENTRANCE TO THE DEVELOPMENT. REVISED ELEVATIONS SHALL BE INCLUDED IN THE CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL BY STAFF.**
- **DIRECT VIEW OF THE LIGHTING ELEMENTS WITHIN THE PARKING GARAGE SHALL BE SHIELDED FROM ADJOINING RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES. CUT SHEETS AND DETAILS SHALL BE PROVIDED WITH THE CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS TO DEMONSTRATE THE LIGHTING ELEMENTS WILL NOT BE VISIBLE FROM ADJOINING RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES.**
- **EMERGENCY GENERATORS FOR BACK-UP POWER SHALL NOT BE LOCATED IN ANY YARD AREAS. SUCH GENERATORS SHALL BE LOCATED WITHIN THE BUILDING/GARAGE, OR ON THE ROOFS. THE LOCATION OF THE GENERATORS SHALL BE CLEARLY IDENTIFIED IN THE CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL BY STAFF.**
- **ABOVE-GROUND ELECTRICAL/TELEPHONE TRANSFORMERS AND SWITCHING CABINETS SHALL NOT BE LOCATED BETWEEN THE BUILDINGS AND THE STREET OR BETWEEN THE BUILDINGS AND PARK PROPERTY. NOTES SHALL BE INCLUDED ON THE CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS TO INFORM THE UTILITIES AND CONTRACTORS OF THIS RESTRICTION.**

- **DEVIATIONS FROM STANDARDS AS LISTED IN 7(a), (b) AND (d) ARE ALLOWED. ON DEVIATION 7(c), THE APPLICANT WORKING WITH ARCHITECTS WILL HAVE AN INTERPLAY BETWEEN THE BALCONIES IN THE OLD AND NEW VERSION. THERE WOULD NOT BE A MAJOR CHANGE IN THE NUMBER OF BALCONIES, AS THE APPLICANT EXPLAINED.**
- **APPLICANT MUST RETURN WITH A CLEAR LANDSCAPE PLAN THROUGHOUT THE ENTIRE DEVELOPMENT, CONCENTRATING ON BUILDING D ON 159TH PLACE NE AND THE COURTYARDS. THE LANDSCAPE FEATURE THAT BORDERS THE PARK WILL RETAIN THE FLAVOR OF THE LATER DESIGN SHOWN ON THE NEW ILLUSTRATIVE LANDSCAPE MASTER PLAN PRESENTED AT THIS MEETING, BUT THE APPLICANT SHOULD BRING IN THE STEPS AND WATER FEATURE TO MAKE IT MORE OF A GRAND ELEMENT.**
- **THE ROOF TOP MECHANICAL SCREEN ON BUILDING D WILL BE MODULATED BY INTRODUCING MORE VERTICAL ELEMENTS TO MAKE THE SCREEN MORE COMPLEMENTARY TO THE BUILDING ITSELF.**
- **THE APPLICANT WILL COME BACK WITH A TRUER AND MORE ACCURATE REPRESENTATION OF THE GREEN INITIATIVES DISCUSSED AT THIS MEETING.**
- **ON THE HOTEL, BUILDING C, THERE WOULD BE TREATMENT TO MITIGATE THE BLANK WALL AFFECT.**
- **PRESENTATION MATERIALS INCONSISTENCIES**
 - a. **WHERE INCONSISTENCIES BETWEEN THE FLOOR PLANS AND ELEVATIONS ARE FOUND AFTER THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD HAS APPROVED THIS PROJECT, THE ELEVATIONS APPROVED BY THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AT THIS MEETING WILL PREVAIL.**
 - b. **IF, AFTER THIS DESIGN REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL, THERE ARE ANY INCONSISTENCIES FOUND IN THE INFORMATION PROVIDED FOR THE ELEVATIONS, FLOOR PLANS, LANDSCAPE PLANS, LIGHTING PLANS, MATERIALS AND COLOR BETWEEN THE PRESENTATION BOARD AND THE 11" X 17" SUBMITTED DRAWINGS, THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AND THE REDMOND PLANNING STAFF WILL REVIEW AND DETERMINE WHICH DESIGN VERSION WILL BE FOLLOWED FOR SITE PLAN ENTITLEMENT.**

MOTION CARRIED (4-0).

Mr. Cope pointed out that there would be no way for the City to monitor the green provisions.

Mr. McKay offered that the applicant could have a page on each building to describe what that architectural team sees has been actually incorporated into each individual building.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MADRID AND SECONDED BY MR. MEADE TO CLOSE THE MEETING AT 10:05 P.M. MOTION CARRIED (4-0).

PRE-APPLICATION

PRE060050, VIP Condominiums

Description: 94,450-square foot building with one floor of commercial and four residential floors; parking for 83 cars and 60 residential units

Location: 7961 170th Ave NE

Applicant: Matt Driscoll with Driscoll Architects

Staff Contact: Asma Jeelani / 425.556.2443

Asma Jeelani, Assistant Planner, presented the staff report for the second pre-application for this five-story, mixed-use building with approximately 60 residential units.

Matt Driscoll with Driscoll Architects, PS, 115 Bell Street, Seattle, WA 98121, explained that the design is primarily the same from the last review. They are trying to use the upper floors with the pitched roof. They now have office space located at the ends of the building and four floors of residential. They are providing the required common open space at the side yard by the alley on grade and on level 5 on the common roof terrace and recreation room. There are 5x10-foot balconies for every unit. There will be 60-70 units. 50% would meet the criteria and 50% would not. There are separate entrances to the office spaces and a minimum residential entry.

COMMENTS BY THE DRB MEMBERS:

Mr. Cope:

- Thought it to be a very handsome project.
- Did not understand the first floor.
- Liked the direction it was going—a nice urban project that is different from the usual.
- Liked the corner.

Mr. Meade:

- Understood that they wanted to do something different.
- Did not like the stucco base at all; would prefer Hardipanel in 12-inch pieces to make a stronger base. Thought stucco unsuitable to this climate, this neighborhood and this community, especially in red.
- Liked the cap piece.
- Thought the concept was great.
- Thought the detailing was great.

Staff had concerns about the angles of the mansard roof shown on pages 9-11 because the corner looked like a tent. Mr. Meade said this was not a concern because this is the way it resolves itself.

Mr. Madrid:

- Wondered about staff making a comment about the entrance needing more definition. (The applicant would address this when going through with details.)
- Asked what is proposed for the area to the left. (The applicant responded that this would be outdoor space and a sitting area.)
- Thought the project was going in the right direction.

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- Liked the project.
- Assumed that the piece to the north was the 60-foot piece added on.
- Recommended that the applicant soften the north base of the very high bare wall.
- Did not think another pre-application would be necessary.

PRE-APPLICATION

PRE060069, 167th Ave NE Duplexes

Description: Rusk Townhomes with 2 duplex buildings, 4 units total

Location: 8330 167th Ave NE

Applicant: Henry Goertzen

Staff Contact: Asma Jeelani / 425.556.2443

Asma Jeelani presented the staff report for this project's first pre-application review. Staff did not have any major issues but needed to see usable open space calculations. The applicant has requested some deviations, but most are within the code limits and acceptable. Reducing the size of the driveway and landscape strip is acceptable. An 18-inch overhang into the setbacks cannot be done on the south, so the applicant would have to figure out a way to design it. The last is for privacy standards that they do not need since this is within code limits.

Carl Colson, Architect, 23623 20th Avenue W, Bothell, WA 98021, described the project as being immediately adjacent to a large public school yard. Although this is a small-sized site, the code is written pretty much the same for large or small sites. This lot is 8,200 square feet, 70 feet wide by 118 feet deep, and is required to have the same setbacks as a larger scale project. A large portion of the site is then eaten up by setbacks. Subterranean parking is not possible. The City requires only one parking space per unit, but the applicant felt it would be quite marketable and more secure to have two covered interior garage spaces for each unit. This keeps the public parking on the street more available for the public. This is a townhouse-style project. Many comparable units of this size have only two bedrooms, but they tried to get three bedrooms in each unit, resulting in narrow footprints, especially Units 1 and 2. The code does require a 6-foot side-yard setback on that front building. There is only 2.4 feet above the maximum allowable height for a 5-foot side-yard setback, and the school will not likely build within 5 feet of the property line. In locating the buildings on the site, they wanted not to disturb the streetscape. There is an interior court that allows all the garages to access off it and does not impact the streetscape. Units 1 and 2 will have a 36-inch-high picket-type fence with residential scale landscaping at the front. Units 1 and 2 will have a private patio at the front, and there will be an overhead arbor at the common sidewalk for Units 1 and 2. For a common open space, the south side rear of the property has more sunshine and more privacy. All units have covered balconies or porches at the second floor level adjacent to the living and dining rooms. The common court between the buildings allows a good area for an underground storm water retention vault. He described the interiors of the units. For the exterior, they plan to use Hardiplank, which is allowed by code, with painted Hardiplank lap siding, stained cedar shingles at the accent areas. Bay windows help break up the visual mass. The applicant provided the side-yard setback open space calculations on the latest site plan.

COMMENTS BY THE DRB MEMBERS:

Mr. Madrid:

- Confirmed that the applicant would later have a landscape architect provide a landscape plan.
- Confirmed that the only trees on the site were two large evergreens in the far northeast corner. The applicant's plan is to retain these trees, if possible.
- Did not have a problem with the setback issue. Thought it was fine at this location.
- Had no problem with the 18-inch overhang.
- Confirmed there would be an overhead arbor with posts at the pedestrians' entrance to the project.

Mr. Cope:

- Agreed that the 5-foot setback would be fine, especially given where it is. The 18-inch encroachment begins at the second floor and that mitigates that issue a lot.
- Suggested introducing more natural light and improving the elevations on A5, Units 1 and 2. (The architect agreed but said their site limitations would not allow more windows in that area. For the distance between the buildings, primary room to primary room must maintain that separation.) (Mr. Meade said Mr. Cope's suggestion would work, and staff agreed.)
- Commented that Units 1 and 2 would be the ones most concerned with the guidelines because they are seen from the street.
- Liked very much the second floor of Units 3 and 4.
- Understood the design guidelines and thought they had met them.

Mr. Meade:

- Said he saw a lot of opportunity here.
- Commented that they do need more pizzazz in the buildings.
- Advised that Units 1 and 2 could add a window over the kitchen sink.
- Suggested that if the buildings are going to harken back to a bungalow style, they should look at tripartite breakdown by integrating some different sidings and expanding the sidings there now. They could use a larger scale lap at the base. If you flip-flop and use two different reveals on the lap, such as an 8-inch reveal at the base and a 4-inch reveal above it, more texture results.

- Recommended exploring the detailing of the trim on the columns to include a capital on the columns. The main portico entry on the front of the elevation is the only place on the whole project where there is any kind of a radius, and he would suggest eliminating that or finding a way to integrate that further into this project.
- Described possible improvements to the shingles, such as dropping the upper siding down or just above the sill, removing some of the shingles in the center so it has a cap, a middle, and a base, modulating by pushing the shingles up and down as they go around the building.
- Thought the covered outdoor balcony on Units 1 and 2 had too small a gable on the roof for a very wide section. On the north elevation that bay roof could be pushed up above the plate line where it is showing now, even 10 inches.
- Suggested creating columns on either side of the balcony rail.
- Recommended illustrating the bays at the front of the roofs at the front, which are not shown on the side elevations.
- Need to make a stronger statement with the cantilevered piece by pairing the knee braces.
- Suggested on Units 3 and 4 that the larger upper gables should be entirely shingles, or entirely the second siding material, or entirely the third siding material. They have an opportunity to integrate those back in the design without having to do a lot of gingerbread detail.
- Recommended the same bellyband treatment at the base from the cantilever around the building.
- Thought the massing of the building was great.
- Thought there should be a couple of knee braces supporting the cantilever on the south elevation and pick up the bellyband and go around.
- Thought the pedestrian walkway should be five feet, not two feet, and lowered flush to the paving.

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- Suggested that the applicant consider how to pave the driveway to indicate a pedestrian walkway.

PRE-APPLICATION

PRE060066, Westgate Technical Center

Description: Demolition of existing building and construction of a 3-story 125,000-square foot commercial building

Location: 8635 154th Avenue NE

Architect: Bob Fadden with Lance Mueller Architects

Landscape Architect: Stephen Klem with Brumbaugh & Associates

Applicant: Mike Hubbard with Capstone Partners

Staff Contact: Amy Keenan / 425.556.2407

Amy Keenan, Associate Planner, presented the staff report. The building and site are L-shaped. One deviation is on the northern edge of the property. The building is only 20 feet off the property line. The majority of the parking would be on the west side of the project with an entryway off 154th Avenue NE.

Bob Fadden with Lance Mueller Architects explained that they are developing a new building within an existing business park environment that has been established for about 20 years. The overall design concerns are to fit into the neighborhood and to minimize the impact on the street and on the surrounding buildings. The building has a larger northern wall face. The site around the building has a mature street setting. The majority of the buildings surrounding the area are two stories in height. The design is formulated to reduce the scale as much as practical and still blend with the other buildings. The materials selected for the buildings are not identical to the other buildings in the area, but try to bring in more tech flavor and more a feeling of design to the building than the older flat surface tilt-up buildings. They had looked at the staff report and thought staff's comments appropriate.

COMMENTS BY THE DRB MEMBERS:

Mr. Madrid:

- Liked the general massing and positioning of the building.
- Liked the entryway and circular driveway.

- Confirmed that the trees at the front of the building would remain.
- Confirmed that the proposed plantings are in the circular area.
- Confirmed that the mechanical screens were back about 60 feet into the roof. (The applicant added that because of the mature trees around the area only the top floor is visible from the distance.)
- Thought the height of the building was fine in relation to nearby buildings.
- Thought the streetscape and trees and the existing landscaping were good. Noted that there was nothing sticking out.
- Liked the general architecture of the building.
- Liked the L-shape of the building—different and unique to this area.
- Thought the parking being in the back was a bonus.
- Thought the building was going in the right direction.
- Thought the landscaping plan looked adequate.

Mr. Cope:

- Wanted the dumpster to be redesigned and compatible with what is being done.
- Thought the project was fine in context with the neighborhood.
- Thought the base to be anemic and maybe just needed to have the sills connected. Does not need a lot of heavy-duty design work, but that is the weak point to this. The base needs a better transition element.
- Inquired how the green or sustainable elements were being incorporated. (The applicant explained that this is a site where all the materials from the demolition process are going to be recycled and reused on the site. They are also working with the City Engineering Division to be allowed to do infiltration of the storm water on the site, along with meeting the other parts of the emergency code. They would have less impervious surface than is currently there.)
- Thought the metal at the cap was good.

Mr. Meade:

- Thought the height of the building was fine. It did not matter to him whether the neighbors were two or three stories high. This zone and the other collection of buildings could easily handle a building of this scale.
- Found the entry piece off the street interesting. Had confidence that the applicant would be adjusting the dimensions slightly from the drawings and there would not be parking on the north side of the building
- Commented that his main concern with the buildings was the entry cover piece because it looked like a placeholder now and needed more pizzazz. This is located in an area with an inventory of really dated buildings. There is an opportunity here to do something more cutting edge and to bring something more exciting to this office park. Color and materials would play a big part in that. (The applicant confirmed this would be a tilt-up project with a combination of materials.)
- Could provide modulation, detail, and texture without going overboard to keep it a simple building.
- Did not see any roadblocks at this time. Would wait to see the larger-scale drawings.
- Thought that having the metal as the cap was fine.
- Would like to see the four-bay repeating pattern. Would like to see them explore that off the body. Might be a chance for something else besides color there. (The applicant explained that they are playing with the color variety and vertical transition in color rather than horizontal transition there.)

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- Agreed about the base.
- Liked the direction and liked the landscape plan.
- Suggested that if the top metal piece is supposed to be the same material as the mechanical screens, maybe there is an opportunity there to make more of those mechanical screens and somehow tie them into an expression of the columns. Make the mechanical screens look part of the building.

There was agreement that there should be another pre-application review with more detail, such as including colors and materials.

PRE-APPLICATION

PRE060023, Microsoft West Campus, Block C

Description: Construction of 1.1 million square feet of office space within 4 new office buildings on a 47-acre site. The proposal includes recreation space, a 4,700-stall underground parking garage, support service buildings and a central plant. The project also includes realignment of 150th Avenue between NE 36th Street and NE 40th Street

Location: 15305 NE 40th Street

Landscape Architect: Mark Brumbaugh with Brumbaugh & Associates

Applicant: Charlene Smith with Callison Architects

Staff Contact: Kerry Kriner / 425.556.2464

Kerry Kriner, Associate Planner, presented the staff report for the third pre-application review of this project. She reported that the applicant was going to describe the commons buildings and some of the landscaping, as well as go over the responses to some of the Design Review Board's previous comments, including the campus entry, integration with adjacent development, integration with the Burke-Gilman Trail, and some of the refined building concepts.

Rick Phillippe, Callison Architects, 1420 5th Ave, Seattle, WA 98101, explained that comments by the Design Review Board members had convinced them to use four different cut stones representing each of the buildings rather than drystack. They developed the base of the buildings by adding a couple courses of a dark, rusticated stone at the base that grabs the lower windows. They introduced the stone across the base of the feature wall. There was more refinement on the stair enclosures and more of the sunscreens.

Mark Brennan with Callison described the Commons area as the town center for this campus for 4,000+ people. The Commons would be composed of defining venues of various types, various employee-centered features, and would also be the home for the campus meeting center. This would be comprised of three buildings around a landscaped pedestrian courtyard. The courtyard's planned geometrics gather the geometrics of various office buildings around it to draw people from the office buildings in taking up pathways either around the building on the interior or through one or two buildings. The Commons buildings pick up the cues from the Eddie Bauer building nearby. He described the general planning of the buildings, the floor plan, the facades, using paneling between the glass that is a very warm, light-colored wood veneer product with a wood grain to the touch to complement the glassy area and the heavier roof from above.

Mark Brumbaugh, Brumbaugh & Associates, landscape architect for this project, described the Commons area, specifically the space in the middle over the garage. They wanted to create an element where there is a buzz in the center of the campus. The uses would be the draw. They would be using water elements made out of stone. This space would be more urban than other Microsoft spaces. They would provide around 500 chairs with tables for use by the people who buy their food in the small cafes nearby. He would return next time with theme-representative landscape plans.

COMMENTS BY THE DRB MEMBERS:

Mr. Meade:

- Confirmed that they would use pavers and cast-in-place concrete for the courtyard. (The applicant said they would have three or four paving types.)
- Thought the plan looked great.
- Thought the buildings were extraordinary
- Liked that they have changed the stone; thought drystack had been a stretch.
- Confirmed with the applicant that they had combined light wells and stairs due to code issues.

Mr. Cope:

- Appreciated Sheet 1.1. Explaining the applicant responses to the previous DRB comments.

- Liked especially the link made to the Burke-Gilman Trail; the staff would appreciate that and be encouraged to use the trail.
- Thought the gestures to the Eddie Bauer building were in the right place for the right buildings.
- Confirmed on page 2.1 that the concept for the forest had not changed.
- Inquired about the leftmost building on 3.1. (The applicant explained that building would be dedicated to amenity spaces, so there would be no food in that one. Would have whatever amenities Microsoft decides its employees generally want.)
- Inquired about the waterway—if it would be operational only during rain and runoff. (The applicant answered that the waterway would be a self-regulating system, so there would always be water there.)
- Questioned the building that is most north from the entry elevation on page 3.5. (The applicant explained that behind that wall are more amenity spaces indicated by A, B and C on the diagram. These spaces do not necessarily want natural light coming in as they are essentially black box retail spaces. Above that is the zone of the multi-purpose room lobby, which has two stairs coming down on either side to the first floor below. All of this is glazed.)
- Thought that particular wall was one of the most visible walls as people enter the site. Inquired if they are relying on landscaping to mitigate the blankness of that wall. (The applicant responded that the focus is actually the composition of that coming up to the knuckle.)
- Thought when he was on NE 40th Street and looking into the site that he was seeing a lot of that wall. It is ironic that all the activity about this entry seems the least articulated. (Mr. Brennan responded that there is a fairly generous amount of landscape area with their intent there being conifers to get a healthy stand of trees in that location as a green backdrop. Mr. Phillippe replied that the buildings are purposely glassy because they are trying to focus on the glazing. They need to have a certain amount of restful blankness to have a balance.)

Mr. Madrid:

- Thought this was such an exciting project.
- Said that the whole site plan is incredible. The Commons is an amazing piece.
- Thought the addition of the bike trail leading to the Burke-Gilman trail was a great idea.
- Asked the applicant to go over the garage entrances, traffic pattern, and visitor parking.

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- Liked the treatment of the main entrance to the buildings and the pinwheel and steel buildings.

The applicant planned to return in mid-February for approval.

ADJOURNMENT

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MADRID AND SECONDED BY MR. MEADE TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 12:15 PM. MOTION CARRIED (4-0).

MINUTES APPROVED ON

RECORDING SECRETARY